

Bertrand Russell Accuses Both Sides of Brainwashing Mankind Into Nuclear War

London, July 23 (Reuters)—British philosopher Bertrand Russell today warned that the leaders of East and West were attempting to brainwash the public into accepting a nuclear war. The 89-year-old Earl, who prefers to be known as plain Bertrand Russell, said:

"Most people in this country as well as in other countries appear to be unaware that the governments of East and West are solemnly preparing by mutual vituperation to create a general state of mind in which the public will acquiesce in a large-scale war."

The veteran campaigner for nuclear disarmament called in a statement for a massive worldwide campaign of protest. He added:

"If it were not happening, I should have thought it inconceivable that Ministers hitherto uncertified (for insanity) could calmly contemplate this wanton and merciless disaster. Yet it is so. Statements have recently been made on both sides of the Iron Curtain claiming that in a nuclear war the side to which the speaker belonged might achieve victory.

"This is utter nonsense and must be known to be nonsense by those who utter it unless they are criminally ignorant of things which it is their duty to know. The peril is imminent and deadly. If you do nothing during the coming weeks of crisis you will have your share in the blame. You will have your part in the crime of killing all those whom you care for. The governments can be stopped in their mad folly, but they can only be stopped by a vast movement of protest."

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, NO. 29

JULY 31, 1961



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

There Will Always Be A Berlin

Some therapeutic perspectives may be brought to bear on the Berlin crisis if one observes that the one-time capital of Germany is not the only spot where contending nations are prepared to kill and die. The blood shed by France and Tunisia over Bizerte, the long and tense deadlock between India and Pakistan over Kashmir, the smoldering truce between Arab and Israeli, the eager readiness of Algeria, Tunisia, Mali and Morocco to plunge into fratricidal struggle over the Sahara once the French have been forced out—all these attest the stubborn obduracy of the human species. Ayub's recent visit here may serve as a reminder that if the great Powers were not the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. but Pakistan and India, mankind today would be urged to line up not over Berlin but over Kashmir; Pakistan would be calling for self-determination, the otherwise pacific Nehru would be defying the UN (as indeed he long has on this issue, where his native Kashmir is at stake) and propaganda, instead of offering the rival merits of Communism and capitalism, would be asking the nations to choose between the Koran and the Bhagavad-Gita, or, less loftily but more effectively, between the defilers of the sacred cow and the eaters of the unclean pig. It's a quarrelsome race that runs this planet, and it's always finding itself a Berlin.

Ideologies Differ But Not Behavior

The only difference between this crisis and umteen others that history records is *T h a t W e a p o n* this time available. Yet nowhere in his TV broadcast on Berlin did Mr. Kennedy say the words mankind needs to hear—that there is now no alternative to learning to live together, that problems can

The U-2's Successor

If the Soviet Union were putting satellites into orbit over the U.S. with the avowed purpose of subjecting our territory to reconnaissance, it is not difficult to imagine the demand in Congress that we find ways to shoot them down. To the Tiro III and the Midas III satellites launched July 12 we are now planning to add a Samos III. According to Missiles and Rockets (July 24), this is "part of a stepped-up effort to get an intelligence replacement for the grounded U-2 operational as soon as possible." The Tiro is for weather observations; the Midas to detect flame from rocket exhausts. The Samos seems to be neither meteorological nor defensive. According to Missiles and Rockets (and only its date for the launching has been denied at the Pentagon), it is "expected to scan Russia for up to a full year—yielding a deluge of photo data" so great that photo analysis units are being expanded to go on "a three-shift-per-day basis when the input begins." What if these satellites are shot down? Is it wise to embark on this large scale aerial espionage without fuller consideration? This may spell serious trouble in the future, as great or greater than any caused by the U-2, the beginning of war in space.

no longer be solved by resort to arms, that our most urgent mobilization must now be of patience. Who says this first and unmistakably will win the real battle, which is a battle for men's hearts and minds. But Mr. Kennedy, like Mr. Khrushchov, as Earl Russell warns in the message at the head of this page, is preparing the public mind for nuclear war, if necessary, and nurturing the illusion that victory in

(Continued on Page Two)

it is possible. In this stance, the two K's are much alike, and this attests the superficiality of the ideological slogans which divide them as compared to the similarity of their behavior. The first response on both sides is to up the swollen military budgets, to mix their offers of negotiation with threats of war, and to make the threats meaningful, as they say at the Pentagon, by talking of nuclear war to their peoples as if it could be the prelude to finally making the world safe for capitalism or communism. Since neither is bloodthirsty and both are basically men of peace one can only conclude that the leaders, like common men everywhere (except perhaps in Japan which had a slight small first taste) suffer from a failure of imagination, do not really understand what they are talking about when they speak of nuclear war.

Even Voters in Minsk

Mr. Kennedy's TV appearance exhibited the characteristic ambivalence of his campaign speeches. It proffered a little mobilization and a little more civil defense, a little more for limited war and a little more for massive retaliation, a little more hope for those who want negotiation and a few more hints of the possible areas in which one might negotiate. It stepped up the arms race but also talked of the need for going on with our "efforts for realistic disarmament." It was at one and the same time minatory and conciliatory. It even talked of satisfying Russia's "historical concern about their security in Central and Eastern Europe, after a series of ravaging invasions" and spoke feelingly of "the Russian people who bravely suffered enormous losses in the Second World War" but without linking this to their fear of another invasion from Germany, now a part of that Atlantic Community which Mr. Kennedy called "the heartland of human freedom" but which all Eastern Europe remembers as the source whence came a cold genocidal ferocity without parallel

Another Nuclear Test Detection Discovery

At press time, the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy was opening three days of hearings on nuclear test detection methods. We will report on them next week. We note that the advance list of witnesses, as in the case of most hearings by this Committee, is made up preponderantly of men from the official agencies with the official point of view. Last week we reported that two private companies, Raytheon and Allied Research Associates, (according to Aviation Week of July 17) claimed a way to identify underground nuclear tests by radio waves. Now the current Journal of the American Acoustical Society brings news that Bell Telephone Laboratories have discovered a way to convert seismic data into audio tapes. Listeners were then able in over 90 percent of the cases to distinguish earthquakes from nuclear explosions. Such identification is a major stumbling block to inspection and agreement. We wait to see whether these or other new approaches get a fair airing from Pentagon and AEC spokesmen more anxious to prevent agreement and resume testing.

in men's annals. In short, the Kennedy speech contained a little something for everybody; it embodied a tactic calculated to win voters even in Minsk, though Mr. Kennedy in his personal postscript counted up the three and a half years he still has to serve in the White House as if he were a prisoner doing time.

All this was wrapped up in semantic war-breeding confusions, perilous delusions and incongruous anti-climaxes. It was almost comic to be told, after a discreet summons to a final Armageddon, that "wholesale prices are actually lower than they were during the recession" and to be asked again, as in the TV cast after Vienna, to do something about the postal deficit. It was also amusing to see that in his call for sacrifice and a fair sharing of burdens by closing tax loopholes, Mr. Kennedy shrank at sacrificing Texas and

Fulbright Challenges Goldwater To Say What He Means By "Total Victory"

"The Senator [Goldwater] says that our fundamental objective must be 'total victory' over international Communism. I must confess to some difficulty in understanding precisely what 'total victory' means in this age of ideological conflict and nuclear weapons. . . . It would be beneficial . . . if those who call for 'total victory' would spell out . . . how it might be achieved and . . . what we would do with a 'total victory' once we had won it. Is it to be won by nuclear war—a war which at the very least would cost the lives of tens of millions of people . . . devastate most or all of our great cities, and mutilate or utterly destroy a civilization which has been built over thousands of years?

"Or can 'total victory' be won without war—by some brilliant stroke of diplomacy or by arguments of such compelling logic that the Communists will acknowledge the error of their ways and abandon their grand imperialistic design? Perhaps the advocates of 'total victory' believe that we can achieve it by . . . engaging in an unrestricted nuclear arms race, even though such a policy would provoke similar measures by the Communist powers.

"The Senator from Arizona suggests that the periphery of freedom 'is growing steadily smaller in direct ratio to our failure to act from strength.' What would a policy of 'strength' involve? Does it mean a military invasion of Cuba which would destroy the Castro dictatorship but which would also alienate the rest of Latin America and necessitate the stationing of marines in Cuba to protect an American imposed regime from Fidelista rebels and guerrillas? Does it mean the commitment of American

forces to interminable guerrilla warfare in the jungles of Laos, a war in which the advantages of geography would be on the side of the Communists?

"Even more perplexing than the question of how to win a 'total victory' is the problem of what we would do with it? Would we undertake a military occupation of Russia and China and launch a massive program to 're-educate' 200 million Russians and 600 million Chinese in the ways of Western democracy? . . .

"The Senator says that I favor a policy of 'non-intervention.' I am indeed opposed to policies that would over-extend the United States, especially when such policies find little support elsewhere in the non-Communist world. By refusing to permit our national strength to be sapped by peripheral struggles, we maximize our power to honor our obligations and commitments all over the world. . . .

"There are limitations to foreign policy. We are neither omniscient nor omnipotent and we cannot aspire to make the world over in our image. Our proper objective is a continuing effort to limit the world struggle for power and to bring it under civilized rules. Such a program lacks the drama and romance of a global crusade. Its virtue is that it represents a realistic accommodation between our highest purposes and the limitations of human capacity. Its ultimate objective is indeed 'total victory,' not for our arms in a nuclear war or for the goal of a world forcibly recast in our image, but rather for a process—a process of civilizing international relations and of bringing them gradually under a worldwide regime of law and order. . . ."

—Senator J. W. Fulbright in the Senate July 24.

cautiously omitted any reference to depletion allowances. If and when we all reach Kingdom Come, the oil millionaires will arrive with their precious tax offsets intact.

From a conventional point of view, perhaps this conventional leadership is necessary, since the men Mr. Kennedy must satisfy in and out of the government are conventionally blinkered; Dirksen and Halleck bear little resemblance to St. Francis and Gautama Buddha. We must be grateful for small mercies; maybe hints of negotiation must be covered by threats of destruction. We hope the Russians will not answer by another arms budget escalation but will make unmistakable their readiness to negotiate even to the American public, which is slowly being pushed into a war psychosis. The sooner the preliminary sparring and opening exchange of fierce threatening roars is over the better, for all kinds of instabilities (notably in East Germany) lurk in the background and may upset the intent of the two Mr. K's to keep the situation from slipping out of their control and into war. We might also suggest, just to emphasize that conventional thinking is as strong in the Kremlin as in the White House, that the \$3 billions Mr. Khrushchov has just added to his arms budget, if spent instead on improving life in East Germany, might not only stem the human flow outward but bring Germans eagerly Eastward. Mr. Khrushchov should remember his own remark about missiles not being sausages.

The Delusions of Civil Defense

Time is short. Grave delusions are fostered by the President's message which may make it more difficult for him to negotiate. His \$200,000,000 extra for civil defense is a trivial gesture which can only create false hopes not real protection. We wonder how many listeners were aware of the terrible meaning of Mr. Kennedy's qualification that in the event of an attack "the lives of those families *which are*

What's At Stake for the AMA

"The AMA . . . cannot help feeling, probably correctly, that any increase in the federal role in medicine weakens the resistance to a national health service. This may be especially true here, for the professed aim of the [Kefauver-Celler] bill is to alter the circumstances that make the industry's heavy investment in promotion profitable. It would make the drug business less profitable, reducing the economic power of a principal political ally of the AMA. It would . . . sharply reduce the amount of promotion, and this would reduce the AMA's own resources, since the AMA, in fighting the increasingly expensive battle against a government-financed health service, has come to rely heavily on the money its journals earn from advertising."

—Science, July 14

not hit in a nuclear blast and fire [our italics] can still be saved—if they can be warned to take shelter and if that shelter is available." How many realize that the cities are written off as expendable, that they will be turned into raging crematoria, and that only in rural areas distant from cities and missile bases can fallout shelters be of any conceivable use? "We owe that kind of insurance," Mr. Kennedy said of shelters, "to our families—and to our country." The insurance we really owe them is that every last possibility of honorable negotiation will be exhausted before we think even of limited military measures or of such "peaceful" steps as blockades of the Black and Baltic seas, a "contingency" plan at which Chester Bowles hinted on *Meet the Press* last Sunday. This is not touch football, and blockades mean war.

There is also a dangerous delusion that may hamper negotiation in the new emphasis on conventional and limited war. Here we come to a striking difference between the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. Mr. Eisenhower ruled out mobilization very early in the Berlin crisis because he did

Some of the Distinguished Physicians Testifying for the Kefauver-Celler Drug Bill

"The essence of their argument [the drug manufacturers and the AMA] is that the practicing physician is the only one who can determine efficacy and that he alone should have the opportunity to grope with the problem of determining for himself whether any new drug is good or bad for his patient. This is an invitation to all manufacturers to dump into the hands of busy practitioners any and all types of good and bad, useful or useless drugs and devices and let them learn, at the expense and peril of their patients, whether they may be of help in each instance . . . much to the delight and profit of the manufacturers."

—Dr. Maxwell Finland, Assoc. P. of Medicine, Harvard, testifying July 25 for the Kefauver-Celler Drug bill.

"The provision that advertisements shall include a warning of harmful effects and a correct statement of a drug's efficacy will be a signal to the doctor to learn more about the drug if he sees something in the advertisement with which he was not familiar, and a warning to abstain from prescribing until he does obtain further information. . . . Any companies that might have been attempting to 'get by' and to 'shade the truth a little' will either have to change their methods or go bankrupt."

—Same day. Dr. Harry F. Dowling, professor and head of Dept. of Medicine, University of Illinois, since 1951.

"I would like to see drug costs brought down to a reasonable level . . . not only to curb exaggerated costs but to prepare for tomorrow when new developments and inflationary trends will make all drug and medical care costs go up. . . . Since the end of World War II, medical care

prices have moved upward more rapidly than any of the major categories in the consumer price index. . . . High costs are just one phase of the problem. The quantity and quality of the promotion and advertising of pharmaceuticals by the drug industry is undoubtedly seriously interfering with the ability of the average physician to render the highest quality of medical care. Even a large teaching hospital such as my own, with highly sophisticated professional control and supervision, must be ever on guard against the vigorous pressures of the drug salesmen."

—Same, July 21, Dr. Martin Cherkassky, director of Montefiore Hospital and the Greater N.Y. Hospital Association.

"It did not seem to the Physicians' Council that educators are adequately concerned about the drift of influence over the habits and beliefs of physicians into the hands of the promoters of drugs. . . . The expenditure for promotion is nearly four times that of the medical schools annually. . . . A defense of the laissez faire attitude by manufacturers is that well educated physicians will not be influenced by misleading advertising. This would seem feeble justification for purveying misleading literature. . . . The Physicians' Council, having explored every possible alternative in an effort to improve the standards of promotion of pharmaceutical products on a voluntary basis, has reluctantly concluded that legislation is necessary in the public interest."

—Same, July 21, Dr. Julius B. Richmond, Prof. of Medicine, Syracuse, on behalf of the Physicians' Council.

Mac Arthur Warns Kennedy Against Military Adventures in Asia

(Continued from Page Three)

not think limited and conventional war possible in the heart of Europe. There was therefore no need to call up reserves. Mr. Kennedy, on the other hand, has been won over to the views of his military adviser, General Maxwell D. Taylor, who quit the Eisenhower Administration in protest. General Taylor's views are congenial to the Army of which he was Chief of Staff; if conventional limited war is possible, then more funds ought to go to the Army and less to the Strategic Air Command. The Army is looking for some way to turn back the clock and resume the game of war without its being mutually suicidal. The idea that armed conflict on the ground over Berlin might provide a "pause for reflection" seems to us dubious; it's hard enough to get that pause before fighting begins; once it starts the hate, fear and enthusiasm unleashed make reflection unlikely. To make conventional war feasible on the ground, the army must be beefed up, so we have the beginnings of mobilization, though without the name. The atmosphere created is not conducive to negotiation.

The More Arms The Less Diplomacy

There are signs that Mr. Kennedy is taking advantage of the Berlin crisis to expand forces for swift mobile military action by conventional means in those peripheral areas, like Southeast Asia and Latin America, where conventional war may well remain possible. The danger here is that the more military power we have the less we rely on diplomacy and the greater our tendency to rush into situations where patience is wiser than intervention. A few years ago we might thus have plunged into endless trouble over Iraq, which was supposed to be on the verge of going Red but has become a prime headache for Moscow. Only a few months ago, had more airlift been available, we might have created an Algeria all our own in Cuba. Mr. Kennedy may have had Laos in mind when he said he intended to "have a wider choice than humiliation or all-out nuclear war." He may feel the current negotiations with Red China over Laos as humiliation, but the current talks are far better than compounding the past errors of the CIA and the military under Eisenhower in Laos by plunging into the jungle with American boys. Our military machine, fueled by another \$6 billion since Kennedy took office, already almost too monstrous for management, is

Most Reviewed Book of The Week

"Mr. Speaker, there was recently published a book titled 'The Un-Americans,' whose subtitle, describing it as the first fully documented account of the notorious Un-American Activities Committee, how their abuse of power is being met by a growing opposition, clearly suggests the scurrilous nature of this publication. It is published in a paperback edition, over 300 pages, priced at 60 cents, by Ballantine Books, Inc., of New York, and is obviously meant to reach as wide an audience as possible.

"The drive to discredit this committee coincides with the present massive peace effort of the world Communist conspiracy which is designed to weaken American security, to disarm and to destroy us . . . at a critical stage of world history, with Berlin and Germany at stake. . . . At a most conservative estimate, the Communist Party within our borders will be expending this year not thousands but millions of dollars, in its propaganda efforts . . . and the dissemination of its tainted literature."

—HUAC Chairman Walter in the House, July 17

"Gore Vidal was the Democratic candidate for Congress from the 29th District of New York in the last election. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the discerning voters of that district spared your party and this House the onus of Mr. Vidal's membership in the Congress of the U.S. A few weeks ago in Life Magazine, Vidal did a subtle and clever smear job upon the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Goldwater]. In the Herald-Tribune of last week he did a vicious and not so subtle a smear job on the Committee on Un-American Activities. He uses the book of Frank Donner, 'The Un-Americans' as the basis for his attack."

—HUAC Member Scherer in the House, July 19.

much too eager for involvement in Asia. We noted in the *New York Herald-Tribune* the day after the President's address that General MacArthur on his recent visit to Mr. Kennedy at the White House had asked if he could be frank and when told he might "proceed to give as frank a talk as the President ever had heard. Net of the talk: keep U.S. troops off the mainland of Asia at all costs." There lies the biggest trap of all for our conventional warriors, a quicksand which could absorb a major share of our youth in endless "limited" war.

Noon, July 26

Fight War Fever By Letting Us Send This Issue to Friends In Stamped Addressed LONG Envelopes

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:*

Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....

7/31/61

Enter gift sub for \$2 (6 mos.) or \$4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class

postage paid

at

Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U. S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. All Mail rates: \$15 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.